



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,767	06/18/2001	Hyun-Jun Lee	P56408	8238

7590
Robert E. Bushnell
Suite 300
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

07/02/2003

EXAMINER

CHEN, ALAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten mark

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,767

Applicant(s)

LEE, HYUN-JUN

Examiner

Alan S Chen

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 22 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21, 23-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the mail server indicated in Claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 3, line 18, applicant discloses "...output the received mail *an* yet maintain privacy...". The word "an" should be "and".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 24 objected to because of the following informalities: The noun "letters" on page 23, line 12, should not be plural. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described

Art Unit: 2182

in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In line 4 of page 22, K is set to the number of registered accounts, and given a range between 1 and the *number of accounts*. In the specification, in line 10-11 of page 12, K is set as the number of registered accounts, and given a range between 1 and the *number of registered accounts*. The number of accounts is a superset of the number of registered accounts, and therefore, not equivalent.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 13 and 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 and 16 recites the limitation "the group" on page 19 and 20, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2182

6. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 12-15, and 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by No. 5,521,719 to Yamada.

In reference to Claim 1, Yamada discloses:

- A) a electronic letter receiver (Fig. 9, element 117) that converts a letter into image data (Fig. 9, element 125) and character data (column 15, lines 19-25), where letter came from a mail server (a telephone network in this case, column 2, lines 15-20), the mail server having a unique address (column 13, lines 45-50);
- B) a letter storing unit (Fig. 1, element 5, 6, and 7) accommodating sorting and storing (Fig. 1, elements 2, 3, and 4) of the image and character data by the account of users (column 6, lines 1-29 and column 7, lines 28-34);
- C) a display unit for displaying information extracted from the image and character data (Fig. 10, element 135 and column 15, lines 20-25);
- D) a user interface outputting a display request signal when an authorized user requests to view a letter addressed to the authorized user and outputting an account control signal having information selected by the authorized user from the displayed information (Fig. 9, element 115-116 and column 13, lines 28-50 and Fig. 10, element 135);
- E) a controller (Fig. 1, element 2 and 13) storing the image and character data received from electronic letter receiver in the letter storing unit. Display request, account control, and printer control signals will come over the bus (Fig. 9, element 111) and detected/responded by controller.
- F) a printer (Fig. 9, element 114) for printing a letter read by controller (Fig. 1, elements 2, 3, and 4) in response to the printing control signal (Fig. 10, elements 135, 111, and 140).

In reference to Claim 2, the letter storing unit included within a personal computer (Fig. 10, element 135).

In reference to Claim 5, a memory storing a system program instruction instructing controller (Fig. 1, element 16 and column 13, lines 17-20).

In reference to Claim 8, the electronic letter receiver is a modem for transmitting and receiving signals over a communication line (Fig. 1, element 12).

In reference to Claim 9, the electronic letter receiver converts received data corresponding to the letter under the control of the controller (column 7, lines 55-60 and column 8, lines 30-42).

In reference to Claim 10, the letter storing unit is divided into a plurality of areas (Fig. 1, elements 5, 6, 7 and Fig. 9, elements 124 and 125).

In reference to Claim 12, Yamada discloses a display unit being a PC (Fig. 10, element 135) accessible to electronic letters obtained over a communication apparatus (Fig. 9, element 111) where image and character data are sent by a controller (Fig. 9, elements 112) to the user who has authority of the PC.

In reference to Claim 14, the apparatus in Claim 1 further comprises a scanner (Fig. 9, element 113) under control of controller (Fig. 9, element 112).

In reference to Claim 15, the apparatus in Claim 1 further comprising a computer interface connecting a personal computer (Fig. 10, element 135) with said controller (Fig. 9, element 112).

Art Unit: 2182

In reference to Claim 18, the printer (Fig. 9, element 114) automatically prints a letter determined by controller (Fig. 9, element 12) base on user's request (column 4, lines 28-42 of Yamada).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Yamada in view of Tyson (www.howstuffworks.com). Yamada discloses using a program memory that stores communication processor/controller basic programs (Fig. 1, element 16 and column 7, lines 3-11 of Yamada).

Yamada does not disclose expressly the specific type of memory device. Tyson discloses the advantages of using flash memory as a memory device, such as the ability to retain memory when there is no power, availability of the devices, and it being a solid-state device.

Yamada and Tyson are analogous art because they are from similar problem solving area involving non-volatile memory.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use flash memory as the specific type of memory device to store the system program to instruct the processor/controller. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to obtain all the advantages of flash memory described by Tyson.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamada with Tyson for the benefit of flash memory to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 6.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Yamada in view of Tyson (www.howstuffworks.com). Yamada discloses using a program memory that stores communication processor/controller basic programs (Fig. 1, element 16 and column 7, lines 3-11 of Yamada).

Yamada does not disclose expressly the specific type of memory device. Tyson discloses the advantages of using EPROM as a memory device, such as the ability to retain memory when there is no power, availability of the devices, and it being a solid-state device.

Yamada and Tyson are analogous art because they are from similar problem solving area involving non-volatile memory.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use EPROM as the specific type of memory device to store the system program to instruct the processor/controller. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to obtain all the advantages of EPROM described by Tyson.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamada with Tyson for the benefit of EPROM to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 7.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Yamada in view of APC. Yamada discloses using an apparatus that has a letter storage unit (Fig. 1, elements 6 and 7).

Art Unit: 2182

Yamada does not disclose expressly the letter storage unit having a backup function for preparing against power failure. APC discloses the need to prevent downtime, so to prevent data loss by using uninterruptible power supplies (UPS) or power backup solutions.

Yamada and Tyson are analogous art because they are from similar problem solving area involving power backup of a system to accommodate for a power failure.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use UPS or power backup solutions to backup the letter storage unit in case of a power failure. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent data loss.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamada with APC for the benefit of power backup to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 11.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Yamada in view of Webopedia. Yamada discloses an apparatus that has interface unit, also known as console (Fig. 9, element 115-116 and column 13, lines 28-50 and Fig. 10, element 135) that has “function keys, numeric keypad, keyboard and so forth” for input operations.

Yamada does not disclose expressly a console where the authorized user inputs a valid password by manipulating the keys of the keypad or the mouse. Webopedia discloses that consoles in general have a display, keyboard *or* other device that allows input, hence a mouse. Furthermore, Webopedia discloses that passwords are used on multi-user systems, where “each user must enter his or her password before the computer will respond to commands. The password helps ensure that unauthorized users do not access the computer.”.

Yamada and Webopedia.com are analogous art because they are from similar problem solving area involving restricting access to a computer.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use 1) a mouse as an option input device in addition to a keyboard and 2) a password to allow only authorized users to gain access to a user interface. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to restrict access only to those who are authorized to prevent tampering or viewing of sensitive information on the computer in addition to an additional input device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamada with Webopedia for the benefit of a mouse and password access to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 13.

11. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Yamada in view of Tyson (www.howstuffworks.com) in further view of Brain (www.howstuffworks.com). Yamada discloses an apparatus that has a computer interface connecting a computer with a controller (Fig. 10, elements 111 and 135). In addition, he discloses the ability to interface a scanner to the computer (Fig. 10, element 140 and Fig. 111, element 135).

Yamada does not disclose expressly the computer interface unit consisting of a parallel port and universal serial bus or using these interface standards to interface a scanner. Tyson discloses parallel ports as being ubiquitous as a computer interface and the ability to interface a scanner. Brain further discloses universal serial bus as being ubiquitous as a computer interface and the ability to interface a scanner.

Yamada and Tyson are analogous art because they are from similar problem solving area involving interface standards for a computer.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use parallel port and universal serial bus standards in a computer interface unit. The

Art Unit: 2182

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent having to custom build a computer interface unit and be able to interconnect other devices that use parallel ports and universal serial bus interfaces, such as a scanner.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamada with Tyson and Brian for the benefit of parallel port and universal serial bus interfaces in addition to interfacing a scanner using these standards, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 16 and 17.

12. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to only display information on a console as described by Yamada (Fig. 10, element 135) to someone who has the ability to login to the console, i.e., one who has the correct login and password. This is especially the case since information on the apparatus described by Yamada has information from a plurality of electronic letter senders, many items that are probably information sensitive.

13. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to display information such as the number of accounts of the users, the number of letters addressed to each account and the subjects of the letters on the display unit (Fig. 10, element 135). The user who has logged into the account can select the account and the subject header of the electronic letter to view the electronic letter. This is how several ISP providers have setup their services. Cox Communications High Speed Internet Service is a good example.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claim 19-21 and 23-28 allowed.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to electronic letter receiver and distributor systems and methods.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,052,442 to Copper et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,229,884 to Toyoda et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,094,277 to Toyoda

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan S Chen whose telephone number is 703-605-0708. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

asc
June 30, 2003



JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100